



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/836,397	04/17/2001	Hark C. Chan	LOCREM-01	7258
23437	7590	07/11/2008		
HARK CHAN PO BOX 2203 CUPERTINO, CA 95015-2203			EXAMINER NANO, SARGON N	
			ART UNIT 2157	PAPER NUMBER
			MAIL DATE 07/11/2008	DELIVERY MODE PAPER

**Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.**

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

# Office Action Summary

**Application No.**

09/836,397

**Applicant(s)**

CHAN, HARK C.

**Examiner**

SARGON N. NANO

**Art Unit**

2157

**Period for Reply** -- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133).
- Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

**Status**

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 06 March 2008.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

**Disposition of Claims**

- 4) ☐ Claim(s) 2-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 2-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

**Application Papers**

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
- Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
- Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

**Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119**

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some \* c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
  - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. \_\_\_\_\_.
  - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

\* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

**Attachment(s)**

- 1) ☒ Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)
- 2) ☐ Notice of Draftperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)
- 3) ☐ Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 4) ☐ Interview Summary (PTO-413)  
Paper No(s)/Mail Date \_\_\_\_\_
- 5) ☐ Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
- 6) ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

***Response to Amendment***

1. This action is responsive to appeal brief filed March 6, 2008. Applicant's arguments have been fully considered and are persuasive. Therefore, the rejection has been withdrawn. However, upon further consideration, a new ground(s) of rejection is made .

***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112***

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Claim2 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. It is not clear whether there is one wide area interface or two. If the is a single wide area interface, the claim language must be amended to reflect such limitation. If , however, there is two wide area interface then the distinction must be made between the two. Appropriate corrections are required. Moreover, claims 2- 11 recite language such as "adapted to" or 'configured to". These terminologies render the claim indefinite as the scope of the claim becomes open ended, undeterminable, and/or based upon intended use. Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitations.

It is this subject matter that must be examined. As a general matter, the grammar and intended meaning of terms used in a claim will dictate whether the language limits

the claim scope. Language that suggests or makes optional but does not require steps to be performed or does not limit a claim to a particular structure does not limit the scope of a claim or claim limitation. The following are examples of language that may raise a question as to the limiting effect of the language in a claim:

- (A) statements of intended use or field of use,
- (B) "adapted to" or "adapted for" clauses,
- (C) "wherein" clauses, or
- (D) "whereby" clauses
- (E) "configured to" clauses.

This list of examples is not intended to be exhaustive. See also MPEP § 2111.04. USPTO personnel are to give claims their broadest reasonable interpretation in light of the supporting disclosure. In re Morris, 127 F.3d 1048, 1054-55, 44 USPQ2d 1023, 1027-28 (Fed. Cir. 1997). Limitations appearing in the specification but not recited in the claim are not read into the claim. E-Pass Techs., Inc. v. 3Com Corp., 343 F.3d 1364, 1369, 67 USPQ2d 1947, 1950 (Fed. Cir. 2003) (claims must be interpreted "in view of the specification" without importing limitations from the specification into the claims unnecessarily). In re Prater, 415 F.2d 1393, 1404-05, 162 USPQ 541, 550551 (CCPA 1969). See also In re Zletz, 893 F.2d 319, 321-22, 13 USPQ2d 1320, 1322 (Fed. Cir. 1989) ("During patent examination the pending claims must be interpreted as broadly as their terms reasonably allow.... The reason is simply that during patent prosecution when claims can be amended, ambiguities should be recognized, scope and breadth of language explored, and clarification imposed.... An essential purpose of patent

examination is to fashion claims that are precise, clear, correct, and unambiguous. Only in this way can uncertainties of claim scope be removed, as much as possible, during the administrative process.”).

### ***Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103***

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

2. Claims 2 – 20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Weiss et al. U.S. Patent No. 4,856,062 (referred to hereafter as Weiss) in view of Kaplan et al. U.S. Patent No. 6,144,641 (referred to hereafter as Kaplan).

As to claim 2, Weiss teaches a system for communication through a wide area network, said system comprising:

an apparatus comprising:

a wide area interface adapted to communication with at least one portable unit via said wide area network: and (see col.8 lines 16 - 34 Weiss discloses a portable device communicating with a host system).

a wireless local interface adapted to communicate with said at least one portable unit when said at least one portable unit is located within a domain (see col.8, lines 10 – 20, Weiss discloses a portable device located in close proximity to a host).

said at least one portable unit comprising:

a wide area interface for communication with said apparatus via said wide area network; and (see col.8 lines 22 – 34, Weiss discloses a portable device in communication with a host in a network)

a wireless local interface adapted to communicate with said apparatus when said at least one portable unit is located, within said domain (see col.8 lines 22 – 34, Weiss discloses a portable device in communication with a host in a network in a building facility); and

wherein at least one member of said apparatus and said at least one portable unit generates non-deterministic digital contents, said one member uses its wireless local interface to deliver at least one of said digital contents to another member of said apparatus and said at least one portable unit, said digital content being used by said apparatus and said at least one portable unit as identification in communication via said wide area network. (see col.2 line 45 – col. 8 line 67, Weiss discloses a verification process between a portable device and a remote host where a user inputs a fixed code along with a non predicted code that is generated at a regular interval of time, without user intervention, in order to gain access and establish communication with a host of a network).

Weiss teaches the invention as mentioned above. Weiss does not explicitly teach that the verification process is conducted using wide area network. However, Kaplan teaches a personal digital assistant is connected to a system using multiple interfaces such as LAN, WAN or plain old telephone system (POTS) (see Kaplan col. 3 line 57 -

col. 4 line 16). It would have been obvious to one of the ordinary skill in the art at the time of the invention was made to include the verification process in Weiss's invention using a wide area network interface as disclosed by Kaplan to provide users located at different geographic locations with data connection capabilities to a computer or a host system.

As to claim 3, Weiss teaches the system wherein said one member comprises a random number generator used for generating said digital contents. (see col. 3 lines 10 – 26 and col.4 lines 12 - 22).

As to claim 4, Weiss teaches the wherein said apparatus and said at least one portable unit each comprises a memory for storing said at least one non-deterministic digital content. (see col. 1, line 61 – col. 2 line 21).

As to claim 5, Weiss teaches the system wherein each of said wireless local interfaces comprises a radio frequency interface. (see col. 8 lines 22 – 34).

As to claim 6, Weiss teaches the system wherein said at least one portable unit is a cellular phone (see col. 8 lines 22 – 34).

As to claim 7, Weiss teaches the system wherein said at least one portable unit is a personal digital assist device (see col. 8 lines 22 – 34).

As to claim 8, Weiss teaches the system wherein said at least one digital content comprises an algorithm (see abstract).

As to claim 9, Weiss teaches the system wherein said at least one digital content comprises a digital code (see col.1 lines 13 - 35).

As to claim 10, Weiss teaches the system wherein said wireless local interface of said apparatus and said at least one portable unit performs authentication in delivering said at least one digital content. (see col.2 lines 60 - 63).

As to claim 11, Weiss teaches the system wherein said one member can detect a presence of said another member and delivers said at least one digital content to said another member automatically without user intervention (see col.6 lines 19 – 49, Weiss discloses establishing communication between a portable computer and a host computer).

As to claim 12, Weiss teaches a method for an apparatus and a portable unit to communicate through a wide area network, comprising:

generating digital contents by one of the apparatus and the portable ( see col. 8 lines 16 - 34);

while the apparatus and portable unit are within a domain, wirelessly delivering at least one of the digital contents by the one of the apparatus and the portable unit to another of the apparatus and the portable (see col. 8 lines 22 – 34).

; and

using the at least one of the digital contents as identification in communication between the apparatus and the portable unit via the wide area network(see col.2 line 45 – col. 8 line 67).



As to claim 13, Weiss teaches the method of claim 12 wherein the one of the apparatus and the portable unit comprises a random number generator for generating the digital contents (see col. 3 lines 10 – 26 and col.4 lines 12 - 22).

As to claim 14, Weiss teaches the method of claim 12 wherein the delivering is conducted using radio frequency signals (see col. 1, line 61 – col. 2 line 21).

As to claim 15, Weiss teaches the method of claim 12 wherein the portable unit is a cellular phone (see col. 8 lines 22 – 34).

As to claim 16, Weiss teaches the method of claim 12 wherein the portable unit is a personal digital assist device (see col. 8 lines 22 – 34).

As to claim 17, Weiss teaches the method of claim 12 wherein the at least one digital content comprises an algorithm (see abstract).

As to claim 18, Weiss teaches the method of claim 12 wherein the at least one digital content comprises a digital code (see col.1 lines 13 - 35).

As to claim 19, Weiss teaches the method of claim 12 wherein the delivering comprises authenticating at least one of the apparatus and the portable unit (see col.2 lines 60 - 63).

As to claim 20, Weiss teaches the method of claim 12 wherein the one of the apparatus and portable unit can detect a presence of the another of the apparatus and the portable unit and deliver the at least one digital content to the another automatically without user intervention (see col.6 lines 19 – 49).

***Response to Arguments***

Applicant's arguments have been considered but are moot in view of the new ground(s) of rejection.

4. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to SARGON N. NANO whose telephone number is (571)272-4007. The examiner can normally be reached on 8 hour.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Ario Etienne can be reached on (571) 272-4001. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Sargon Nano  
July 7, 2008

/Ario Etienne/  
Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2157